REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated November 10, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-34 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being broader than the enabling disclosure. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,382 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,448,158 to Peng et al. (hereinafter "Peng"). Claims 1-34 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Peng.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being broader than the enabling disclosure is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The Examiner states:

> The enabling disclosure is limited to using amorphous indium tin oxide (ITO) or indium zinc oxide as the amorphous material which is crystallized by exposure to light and is also limited to using oxalic acid in an etching step to remove the indium tin oxide for indium zinc oxide in the amorphous state which is not crystallized by light exposure. It is also not well known in the art what other amorphous materials may be used and what other etching solutions may be used which form crystalline materials on exposure to light, are transparent and conductive for using in liquid crystal displays and which may be removed without removing crystallized forms thereof. Peng et al. shows that a method of exposing ITO amorphous layers to light to form crystalline areas with removal of non-exposed areas by oxalic acid as disclosed in applicants' specification is not one of the many obvious methods of carrying out the steps of patterning the second electrode of the instant claims but rather is a non-obvious patentable method.

The Examiner here is attempting to read specific examples from the specification into the claims. Applicants have provided two examples of materials that are encompassed in the disputed claim features. Applicants are entitled to all such materials that would be obvious to those of skill in the art that fall within the scope of the features claimed. The Examiner cites

Peng et al. to argue that one of the examples in the Applicants' disclosure was not obvious because it was subject of an issued patent. At best, that means the specific example cited was not obvious. That in no way proves that no other such materials exist and that they are not well known to those of skill in the art. Further, not every possible embodiment of the invention is required to be disclosed by the Applicant, otherwise every claim limitation would include long laundry lists of obvious items. When interpreting claims, it is not permissible to read in limitations or specific embodiments from the specification, but this appears to be exactly what the Examiner is attempting to do. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The present invention is assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 14816, frame 789. Chang is also assigned to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd., which assignment is recorded at reel 14004, frame 421. The present invention at the time the invention was made was subject to an obligation of assignment to LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Chang cannot be applied as prior art against claims 1, 10-13, and 26-28. Therefore, as Peng by itself is insufficient to reject claims 1-34, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-34 are allowable over the cited art.

The Applicants will file a terminal disclaimer upon an indication that the claims are otherwise allowable to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection over Chang in view of Peng.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 10, 2006 By _____
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant